

## REMARKS

### Claim Summary

Claims 1 and 23 are amended to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Support for the changes can, for instance, be found in FIG. 6, and also in the specification as filed at page 4, lines 20-26, and at page 10, line 26 to page 11, line 7. Thus, no new matter is added.

Claims 13, 15, 17, and 24 are amended to clarify and simplify the language.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

### Objection to the Claims

In response to the objection to claim 24 for informalities, Applicant has reworded claim 24 to recite “the field is the synchronization field” for clarity, as requested. Similarly, Applicant has reworded claim 24 to recite “when the field is the signaling field” for clarity.

### Rejection of claims 1-5, 9, 10, 13-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 23 to recite “defining a position of at least one subsequent burst comprising a synchronization field.” Support for this amendment can be found in FIG. 6, and also in the specification as filed at page 4, lines 20-26, and at page 10, line 26 to page 11, line 7. Applicant submits that claims 1 and 23 as amended overcome the rejection. More particularly, Applicant respectfully submits that “a synchronization field” in the subsequent burst could be a part of a subsequent superframe. Therefore, a burst comprising a synchronization field can

indicate the start of a new superframe. Accordingly, “a synchronization field” of the subsequent burst is different than the synchronization field of the current superframe.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 23 as amended overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant requests that claims 1 and 23 may now be passed to allowance.

The Office action has rejected claims 13, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “the received synchronization pattern.” In response, Applicant has amended claims 13, 15, and 17, as requested in the Office Action, to provide proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, the rejection is believed to be moot. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests the rejection to be withdrawn.

#### Acknowledgement of Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges the allowability of claims 1-5, 9, 10, and 13-23 once Claims 1, 13, 15, 17 and 23 are amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 set forth in the Office Action. Applicant has so amended these claims. Applicant also acknowledges the allowability of claim 24.

#### Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant’s attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola,  
Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
1303 East Algonquin Road  
IL01/3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Schaumburg, IL 60196  
Customer Number: 22917

By: /Valerie M. Davis/

Valerie M. Davis  
Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 50,203

Telephone: 847-576-6733  
Fax No.: 847-576-0721  
Email: [vdavis@motorola.com](mailto:vdavis@motorola.com)